

REMARKS

Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-23 are pending. Claims 1 and 17 are amended herein. No new matter is added by the claim amendments.

102 Rejections

Claims 1, 10 and 18 versus Yuki et al.

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 1, 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Yuki et al. ("Yuki;" U.S. Patent No. 5,805,149). The Applicants have reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 1, 10 and 18 are not shown or suggested by Yuki.

According to independent Claim 1, a display unit includes a display panel that includes "a fixed, active pixel border region permanently dedicated to displaying a border attribute, wherein said fixed, active pixel border region surrounds said rectangular pixel frame buffer region and comprises a width of less than 128 pixels" (emphasis added).

According to independent Claim 10, a display unit includes a display panel that includes "a fixed, active pixel border region permanently dedicated to displaying a border attribute, wherein said fixed, active pixel border region surrounds said rectangular pixel frame buffer region and contains top, bottom, right and left border regions, wherein said fixed, active pixel border region comprises a width of less than ten pixels" (emphasis added).

According to independent Claim 18, a handheld device includes a display panel that includes “a fixed, active pixel border region permanently dedicated to displaying a border attribute, wherein said fixed, active pixel border region surrounds said rectangular pixel frame buffer region and comprises a width of less than five pixels” (emphasis added).

Yuki appears to show only a border display portion 502 that measures at least 280x312 pixels (see Figure 3b of Yuki) in width. The border display portion of Yuki is thus clearly more than 128 pixels in width. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that Yuki does not show or suggest a fixed, active pixel border region that is less than 128 pixels (or 10 pixels or 5 pixels) in width as recited in Claims 1, 10 and 18.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Yuki does not show or suggest the limitations of independent Claims 1, 10 and 18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 10 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is traversed and that Claims 1, 10 and 18 are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1, 10 and 18 versus Canova et al.

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 1, 10 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Canova et al. (“Canova;” U.S. Patent No. 6,961,029).

The instant application is a continuation-in-part of Canova (the “parent application”). Claims 1, 10 and 18 each recite a fixed, active pixel border region

that is less than 256 pixels (or 10 pixels or 5 pixels) in width. These claim limitations are fully supported by the parent application and thus these limitations have the effective filing date of the parent application (that is, for the purposes of the claim limitations just mentioned, the instant application and Canova have the same filing date). Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Canova does not qualify as prior art. The Examiner is respectfully directed to MPEP § 706.02(V)(B).

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 1, 10 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) is traversed and that Claims 1, 10 and 18 are in condition for allowance.

103 Rejections

Claim 1

According to the instant Office Action, Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki et al. ("Matsuzaki;" U.S. Patent No. 6,140,992) in view of Kim et al. ("Kim;" U.S. Patent No. 5,355,443), Singla et al. ("Singla;" U.S. Patent No. 6,597,373) and Dinwiddie et al. ("Dinwiddie;" U.S. Patent No. 6,195,078). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claim 1 are not shown or suggested by Matsuzaki, Kim, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination.

As presented above, independent Claim 1 recites a fixed, active pixel border region that is less than 128 pixels in width. Matsuzaki appears to show only a border that measures at least 128x128 pixels (see Figure 6 of Matsuzaki –

the vertical border is $[1280 \text{ minus } 1024]/2$ equals 128 pixels, and the horizontal border is $[1024 \text{ minus } 768]/2$ equals 128 pixels). The border display portion of Matsuzaki is clearly not less than 128 pixels in width. Consequently, Applicants respectfully submit that Matsuzaki does not show or suggest a fixed, active pixel border region that is less than 128 pixels in width as recited in Claim 1.

Applicants further submit that neither Kim nor Singla nor Dinwiddie overcomes the shortcoming of Matsuzaki. Neither Kim nor Dinwiddie appears to show a fixed, active pixel border region as claimed. Singla describes a border region 106 (Figure 2) that has a width of $[X_DISPLAY (1024 \text{ pixels}) \text{ minus } X_IMAGE (640 \text{ pixels})]/2$, which equals 192 pixels, or $[Y_DISPLAY (768 \text{ pixels}) \text{ minus } Y_IMAGE (480 \text{ pixels})]/2$, which equals 144 pixels; see column 3, lines 1-6, of Singla. Thus, the minimum width described by Singla does not appear to be less than 128 pixels in width as recited in Claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed and that Claim 1 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 2-4 and 8

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 2-4 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki in view of Kim, Yuki, Ogawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,018,331), Singla and Dinwiddie. The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of

the present invention recited in Claims 2-4 and 8 are not shown or suggested by Matsuzaki, Kim, Yuki, Ogawa, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination.

Claims 2-4 and 8 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations. As presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1.

Applicants further submit that neither Yuki nor Ogawa overcome the shortcomings of Matsuzaki, Kim, Singla and Dinwiddie. Yuki is discussed above. Ogawa appears to show only a border that measures at least 212x240 dots (see Figure 2A of Ogawa, for example – the vertical border is $[1280 \text{ minus } 800]/2$, which equals 240 dots, and the horizontal border is $[1024 \text{ minus } 600]/2$, which equals 212 dots).

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Yuki, Ogawa, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 and that Claim 1 is allowable over these references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 2-4 and 8 are also allowable over these references as being dependent on an allowable claim. Consequently, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 2-4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 5-6 and 9

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 5-6 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki in view of Kim, Yuki,

Singla and Dinwiddie. The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 2-4 and 8 are not shown or suggested by Matsuzaki, Kim, Yuki, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination.

Claims 5-6 and 9 are dependent on Claim 1 and recite additional limitations. As presented above, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1.

For the reasons presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that Yuki does not overcome the shortcomings of Matsuzaki, Kim, Singla and Dinwiddie.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Yuki, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 1 and that Claim 1 is allowable over these references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 5-6 and 9 are also allowable over these references as being dependent on an allowable claim. Consequently, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 5-6 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 10-14 and 16-17

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 10-14 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki in view of Kim, Ogawa, Singla and Dinwiddie. The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention

recited in Claims 10-14 and 16-17 are not shown or suggested by Matsuzaki, Kim, Ogawa, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination.

As presented above, independent Claim 10 recites a fixed, active pixel border region that is less than 10 pixels in width. Claims 11-14 and 16-17 are dependent on Claim 10 and recite additional limitations.

Also as presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Matsuzaki nor Kim nor Ogawa nor Singla nor Dinwiddie shows or suggests a fixed, active pixel border region that is less than 10 pixels.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Ogawa, Singla and Dinwiddie, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 10 and that Claim 10 is allowable over these references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 11-14 and 16-17 are also allowable over these references as being dependent on an allowable claim. Consequently, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 10-14 and 16-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Claims 18-23

According to the instant Office Action, Claims 18-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by Matsuzaki in view of Kim, Yuki, Ogawa, Singla, Dinwiddie and He et al. ("He;" U.S. Patent No. 6,323,849). The Applicants have reviewed the cited references and respectfully submit that the embodiments of the present invention recited in Claims 18-23 are not shown or

suggested by Matsuzaki, Kim, Ogawa, Singla, Dinwiddie and He, alone or in combination.

As presented above, independent Claim 18 recites a fixed, active pixel border region that is less than 5 pixels in width. Claims 19-23 are dependent on Claim 18 and recite additional limitations.

As presented above, Applicants respectfully submit that neither Matsuzaki nor Kim nor Yuki nor Ogawa nor Singla nor Dinwiddie shows or suggests a fixed, active pixel border region that is less than 5 pixels in width. Applicants further submit that He does not overcome the shortcoming of these references. He does not appear to show a fixed, active pixel border region as claimed.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that Matsuzaki, Kim, Ogawa, Singla, Dinwiddie and He, alone or in combination, do not show or suggest the limitations of Claim 18 and that Claim 18 is allowable over these references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 19-23 are also allowable over these references as being dependent on an allowable claim. Consequently, Applicants respectfully assert that the basis for rejecting Claims 18-23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is traversed.

Conclusions

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-23.

Applicants respectfully assert that Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 16-23 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, Applicants respectfully solicit allowance of these claims.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO HAO & BARNES LLP



William A. Zarbis
Reg. No. 46,120

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060

Date: 7/16/07